REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-13 are pending. By this Amendment, claim 7 is amended to avoid the claim objection from paragraph 1 of the Office Action. Reconsideration in view of the above amendment and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants again provide a copy of the PTO/SB/08a filed on January 4, 2006 for the Examiner's consideration. In paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that the form was not considered since it was not included with a copy of the listed references or a copy of the International Search Report. This statement is clearly incorrect at least with respect to the copy of the International Search Report which was indicated to be received by the U.S. Receiving Office in the Notice of Acceptance of Application dated November 27, 2006. As such, at least the International Search Report (including the information therein) should have been considered by the Examiner. Moreover, attached hereto are copies of each of the documents cited in the International Search Report for the Examiner's convenience. It is believed that the International Authority should have forwarded the documents to the U.S. Receiving Office along with all the other parts of the application indicated in the Notice of Acceptance. In any event, the Examiner should have raised this objection in conjunction with the first Office Action. Moreover, it is not believed that any fees are necessary for consideration of this information.

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Aida et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,445,249) in view of Besson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,705,982). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 is directed to dynamic vibration absorber comprising a plurality of vertically mounted U-shaped leaf springs which are interposed between the frame body and the weight so

as to hold the weight with respect to the frame body movably with respect to all directions in a plane and immovably in a vertical direction perpendicular to the plane.

In the Office Action, the Examiner states that Besson et al. teach in Figure 1 the use of U-shaped leaf springs used to damp movement of a weight 2, 3 within a frame 10. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assessment of Besson et al. In particular, Besson et al. makes no mention of U-shaped leaf springs in its disclosure. Rather, as clearly shown in Figures 5-8, Besson et al. teaches the use of a wire spring. See also, the description in column 5, lines 37-60 which indicate various portions of the spring to fit within grooves, which is consistent with the description of a wire spring, not a leaf spring as claimed.

Thus, the premise of the Examiner's rejection is flawed in that Besson et al. does not in the first instance teach or suggest the use of U-shaped leaf springs. More specifically, the Examiner's proposed substitution of the wire springs in Besson et al. for the arrangement in Aida et al. would be inappropriate according to Applicants, because, for example, it is difficult to hold the weight immovably in a vertical direction using the wire springs in Besson et al.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 9-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Aida et al., in view of Besson et al., and further in view of Wood (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0134733). This rejection is respectfully traversed at least because claims 9-13 are dependent on claim 1, and are patentable by virtue of that dependency.

In addition, the combination of bearings 8 and receptacles 9 disclosed in Aida et al. only hold the weight portion 1 movably with respect to all directions in a plane and immovably in a vertical direction perpendicular to the plane. The bearings and receptacles in Aida et al. do not determine a natural frequency for the weight portion because bearings 8 and receptacles 9 do not

have a resiliency with respect to all directions in a plane. While the wire springs in Besson et al. and the dynamic absorber in Wood may teach tuning to a natural frequency, both Besson et al. and Wood rely on resiliency to create the natural frequency tuning effect. Applicants respectfully submit that the arrangement in Aida et al. is purposely made without resiliency, such that it would not be amenable to tuning as taught by Wood.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all the claims are patentable and that the entire application is in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency, or credit any overpayment, in the fee(s) filed, or asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Account No. 14-1140 under Order No. PTB-1207-131.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable to place the application in better condition for allowance, he is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /Paul T. Bowen/
Paul T. Bowen
Reg. No. 38,009

PTB:jck
Attachment: Copy of PTO/SB/08a and references

901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100